DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 393 827 SP 036 572

AUTHOR Watkins, Regina M.; And Others
TITLE The University Community Where Equity Can Happen: Getting Past the Rhetoric.
PUB DATE Feb 96
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (48th, Chicago, IL, February 21-24, 1996).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Androgyny; College Faculty; *Educational Environment; *Educational Opportunities; Elementary Secondary Education; Equal Education; Higher Education; Nondiscriminatory Education; *Professional Recognition; *Sex Bias; *Sex Discrimination; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Gender Issues

ABSTRACT

This paper, which includes a substantial literature review, examines the perceived impact of the academic environment on the personal and professional opportunities of male and female faculty and addresses strategies to promote gender equity in the classroom. Survey data were gathered from a random sample of faculty at a southern postsecondary institution. Factors considered included child care, tuition waivers, opportunity for advancement, faculty development and mentoring, and employment assistance for spouses. The sample ranged in age from 29 to 64; 55.6 percent were male, 90.1 percent were white; most held Ph.D. or Ed.D. degrees; 56.3 percent were full time faculty members; 78 percent were married; and 70 percent had one or more children. Findings revealed that men and women appeared to view structural opportunities within higher education in the same way and to have similar perceptions of what universities should be doing. Of significance were differences between responses for males and females on attitudinal items concerning inequities for the sexes. Women believed they were constrained professionally by the existing informal structure or because of outside responsibilities. Finally, the paper looked at what teacher educators can do to create an androgynous classroom climate. The paper concludes with a self-quiz and suggested classroom strategies that foster androgynous environments, curricula, and institutions. An appendix provides the survey instrument and a table of results. (Contains 31 references.) (ND)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 393 827

THE UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY WHERE EQUITY CAN HAPPEN: GETTING PAST THE RHETORIC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Watkins

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Regina M. Watkins, Lynn C. Gillaspie and Jerri H. Bullard

University of North Alabama

Paper presented at the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 48th Annual Meeting, February 21-24, 1996, Chicago, Illinois

SP036572

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

For the past three decades, society has focused on the changing socialization patterns and roles for males and females. Research has concentrated on such topics as varied roles within the family, enhancing education for women, the impact of larger numbers of women in the workplace, and gender issues in the classroom. Inherent in much of this research is the idea that if we alter either training of those who participate within an organization, or the demographics of the participants, that the organization itself will change. As a result, emphasis has been placed on creating a diverse workplace which, it is believed, will subsequently lead to an organization supportive of equality and opportunity for all those who are involved. This idea is especially true in higher education. Most colleges and universities encourage the diversity of, and opportunities for, its faculty. Yet, whether or not and the degree to which this has occurred within the academic realm are still uncertain.

It has been shown (Kantor, 1977; Edwards, 1975; Piore, 1975; Baron, 1984) that the organizational structure and culture directly influence individuals within the workplace. Further, institutional issues and practices directly affect career opportunities for both men and women in higher education. In particular, research has shown that structural and personal constraints impact the aspirations and level of success of women (Lindsey, 1994, p.276). Important, as well, is the perception of the employee of his/her work environment. The purpose of this paper is to examine the perceived impact of the academic environment on the professional attainment of

male and female faculty and to address strategies that promote gender equity in the classroom.

RELATED ORGANIZATIONAL LITERATURE

The term organization has been defined by social scientists in a variety of ways. For example, Simon (1947, p. xvi) refers to organizations as a "complex pattern of communications and other relations in a group of human beings." Through this structure, individuals are provided information, assumptions, goals and attitudes that influence behavior both on the part of the individual and those with whom they interact. The sociologist calls this pattern a "role system"; to most of us it is more familiarly known as an "organization." (Simon, 1947, p. xvi).

A second view of organizations is reflective of structural functionalism. In this sense, the organization is seen as having goals, some form of structural pattern dividing tasks to perform its functions, and an identifiable boundary. Both approaches or levels of analysis are important when considering the opportunities of workers within a system or organization (Ford, 1988, pp. 321-371).

Kanter (1977, pp. 245-253) has focused extensively on the effects of the internal labor market and ritualism in bureaucratic structures on workers. It is obvious that the opportunity for advancement and growth, the power--the ability to mobilize resources, and the proportions of a group filling that level position can positively or negatively affect the performance and perceptions of workers. If individuals feel that their job is low in opportunities for mobility and growth they tend to:

limit their aspirations, have lower self-esteem, seek satisfaction outside work, have a horizontal orientation to peers rather than to superiors, be critical of or fail to identify with higher-ups, not be active in seeking change in the structure, discourage peers from upward mobility, define success in ascriptive rather than task terms, be more attached to a local unit than to the overall organization, not expect to do any better, and last, value only extrinsic rewards (social or economic) (Ford, 1988, p. 330; Presthus, 1962).

Similarly, according to Kanter (1977, pp. 245-253), people low in power tend to exhibit similar outcomes. They are more likely to foster lower group morale, be more authoritarian, and restrict opportunities for the growth of other workers. This behavior is especially obvious in relations to subordinates or those who might be in competition with them for scarce and valued resources within the workplace. These individuals are also more likely to use subordinates to present themselves in a more positive light, judge themselves to gain a superior feeling and to strive for control over their own "kingdoms".

Consequently, a change in the organizational environment in the opposite direction of that previously described can foster positive perceptions and outcomes on the part of the worker. For example, people whose jobs are upwardly mobile and who perceive opportunity for growth will be more likely to have high aspirations, an orientation to people above them and the larger organization, be more orientated

toward action when blocked and more likely to view work as a central life interest (Ford, 1988).

The culture of the organization appears to affect both the workers and those who judge their worth or their performance regardless of gender. As such, self-fulfilling prophecy functions to limit opportunities for the individual as well as limits outcomes for the organization. For example, women historically have been viewed and seen as undesiring of advancement or career opportunities. Yet many men in dead-end positions, which are similar to the majority of women's jobs, are not career oriented. Therefore, the nature of the job may be shaping aspirations and expectations more directly than simply the issue of gender. Individuals, regardless of gender, adapt to their organizational environment.

Kanter (1977, pp. 245-253) makes a third point pertinent to this discussion. The number of workers belonging to any identified subgroup, if smaller in number, will exhibit certain characteristics. Workers who are in the minority often feel as if they are on display, feel pressure to conform, make fewer mistakes, try to disappear socially, and find it difficult to feel "creditable" to peers and superiors. In addition, these individuals may feel isolated, may actually be excluded from informal peer networks and may be less likely to be mentored by a superior or a colleague. As a result, many may face psychological consequences such as withdrawing from the larger group and dealing with increased stress. As Kanter notes, (1977, pp. 251-253) "for blacks, Hispanics, women, Native Americans and other visible minorities these feelings mean that tokenism, whether perceived or real, in nontraditional jobs puts

them in a stressful, nonsupported, display positions for which they must be well prepared."

DEFINING THE IMPACT OF A LARGER CULTURE: THE SOCIETAL ENVIRONMENT

As Bell and Chase (1993) report, previous research attributed women's lack of leadership roles to their internal lack of leadership aspirations (Estler, 1975). Even though Adelman's 1991 study confirmed that parents set lower aspirations for daughters than sons, Widnall (1988) reports that a study at Stanford University (Zappert and Stanbury, 1984) shows no significant difference between the aspirations of male and female college freshmen. Additionally, the number of freshmen women who plan to complete terminal degrees has increased significantly in the last 20 years (Astin, 1990). In view of these educational aspirations, it is not surprising that men and women's career choices are more convergent than before (Astin, 1990). Therefore, the hypothesis that women's lack of leadership roles can be attributed more to external factors than internal barriers seems logical (Estler, 1975; Bell and Chase, 1993).

Although various studies of the 1960's and 1970's indicated that women were more likely than men to lower their career aspirations (Adelman, 1991; Bayley, 1990), recent findings show that this process cannot only be stopped but also reversed. Henley and Bartle (1990) found that participating in Women's Studies increases career aspirations for all women and significantly so for women of color. A study by the Commission of Professionals in Science and Technology (1987) suggests that women are more likely to be self-supporting and to have less confidence

in their abilities than males (Widnall, 1988). Widnall (1988) also suggested that the lowering of aspirations and dropping out of graduate school could be stopped with sensitivity to women's needs and roles by higher education institutions.

Summary: Women's aspirations, fulfillment and success can be increased by: 1) providing and encouraging participation in Women's Studies; 2) educating parents, teachers, and females about career choices; 3) increasing internships and work programs that allow leadership roles for women; 4) increasing financial support for college women; 5) increasing campus sensitivity to the dual roles of women; and 6) increasing sensitivity to discrepancies in educational opportunities due to gender. Females can be "mentored" into achieving high levels of success in their environments.

EXAMINING THE SUPPORTIVE ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

Changing the socialization patterns for women should be accomplished by changes in the organizational structure that encourage equity in career paths for males and females. Berger and Foster reported that societal standards contribute to inequitable expectations and policies. For instance, society continues to perceive men's careers as more important than women's (qtd. in Barbee, 1990, p. 107). With emphasis on men's careers, women have not institutionalized primary sources of "information and support" associated with the benefits of male-oriented, informal networks (Wood, 1994, p. 284). Both formal and informal networking fulfills many needs for men, and potentially women, in higher education. Examination of that

organizational norm should be re-visited as more women enter professions and positions traditionally confined to men.

It is evident that institutional practices affect directly career opportunities for women in higher education. Although these practices should foster the success of women rather than place obstacles in their paths, existing barriers to "advancement, including promotion, tenure, and academic administrative promotions, can create an atmosphere on campuses that continues to send the message that women are not first class citizens" (Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Austin, 1991, p. 19). Hiring procedures may also make it more difficult for women to work at institutions of higher learning.

Further, organizational culture appears stagnant in proactively providing equal career and financial opportunities for women. Lindsey, asking the question, "Where does the academic path lead for women Ph.D.s?" reports that most serve "...in two- and four-year state colleges...with heavy teaching loads and administrative responsibilities... . They are likely to be instructors and assistant professors" (Lindsey, 1994, p. 276). Following existing trends "...the prevalent prediction for the next 20 years is that women will continue to inundate lower and part-time faculty ranks and suffer the brunt of economic constraints in education" (German, 1989, p. 13). Although more women are entering the world of higher education, few institutional incentives promote their long-term success in positions of prestige and authority.

ADDRESSING THE NEED FOR EMOTIONAL SUPPORT SYSTEMS

The typical work environment confines women to the rank of an "outsider", therefore complicating their "work lives in ways men seldom experience" (Wood, 1994, p. 283). Personally, this conflict for women is especially painful because their innate nature values relationships among colleagues as a precursor to their "sense of fit." The organizational climate in higher education continues to promote, if in a subtle fashion, cultural and structural deterrents that are not only internal but also external barriers to the emotional health of women employees and therefore the organization (Marshall, 1993).

Relationships with colleagues are crucial to personal and job satisfaction. Because most informal networks are largely or exclusively male, women often feel unwelcome. Further, "feminine socialization does not encourage them to assert themselves and claim position in a group" (Wood, 1994, p. 284). In fact, women feel a sense of tokenism and in attempts to bond with men eventually emulate typical male behavior including talking loudly and using profanity. As a result, women avoid networking which is a primary source of communication and support (Wood, 1994).

In the world of higher education, a mentor is more than a trusted friend, s/he is a "senior colleague who advises and assists a junior employee in building a career" (Wood, 1994, p. 284). Unfortunately, women are much less likely to have mentors than majority men (Wood, 1994). Even in graduate school, female "graduate students spend less time with faculty, are less relaxed when they do, and feel they are not suitable" as mentees (Lindsey, 1994, p. 275). Women continue to be isolates

in this male-dominated environment for numerous reasons, including that men sometimes feel uncomfortable mentoring women for fear of sexual connotations or innuendoes. Further, men may simply feel uncomfortable working that closely with women because of a lack of knowledge about female development and psychology. Whatever their reasons, this practice "perpetuates the status quo in which white men gain assistance in climbing the corporate ladder while women...receive little help" (Wood, 1994, p. 284). Women usually have no one to assist them in shaping their experiences to gain access into the present system, but many have not actively pursued mentor/mentee relationships and the subsequent benefits.

It is obvious that organizational structure can be designed to enhance, or conversely, limit opportunities for women. Women who are already working in higher education should continue to strive for change within the university system.

CREATING A POSITIVE FAMILIAL AND CAREER BALANCE

According to Hensel (1991, p. 2) "nearly one half of the women who stay in academia remain single or childless, which raises the question of how work/family conflicts influence the choices women make." A faculty career is demanding with the average professor working approximately 55 hours per week (Hensel, 1991; Bird, 1984; Dublon, 1983; Weishaar, et al., 1984). When other responsibilities are added for the woman in higher education, such as child care and home maintenance, a woman can work 70 or more hours per week (Hensel, 1991). Also, women in higher education who choose to have children are often pursuing tenure or promotion during the peak of their childbearing years (Hensel, 1991). The

consequence of this situation is that women are less likely to "succeed" in the traditional sense in higher education because of the structural constraints placed upon them by attempting to have both a family and career. It has been noted that women in academia continue to be paid less than men, are promoted more slowly and receive tenure at lower rates (Manning, 1993).

A number of recent studies have examined differences in career paths and success for men and women in higher education and have noted the areas of greatest concern for individual related to the issues of family (Selke and Collins, 1994; Weishaar, et al., 1984, Bird, 1984; Dublon, 1983). Weishaar, et al., (1984) noted that the most often cited concern about balancing family and career was "too much to do" rated first with "pressure to do well" rated second.

How, then, can colleges and universities create an environment that is supportive for both males and females in relation to family? Institutions can provide opportunity to stop the tenure clock for one year, thus allowing women the opportunity to adjust to the addition of a family member without the added pressure of the tenure clock ticking away. A second and third change might be to provide on-campus child care/elderly care or the opportunity for flexible schedules that allow faculty members, within reason, to work classes around family obligations. For all workers, but for women in particular, changes in the organizational structure should diminish differences in career paths that presently exist.

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

Institutional issues and practices directly affect career opportunities for both men and women in higher education. In particular, research has shown that structural and personal constraints impact the aspirations and level of success of women. The purpose of this study was to examine the perceived influence of the academic environment on the professional attainment of male and female faculty.

METHODOLOGY

Information was obtained through mail questionnaires distributed to a random sample of faculty at a southern post-secondary institution. Questions were designed to assess the degree to which a university's environment promotes and supports, or should support, personal and professional opportunities for faculty. An evaluation of the work environment was carried out through a series of questions designed to assess the perceived degree to which an institution provided child care, tuition waivers, opportunity for advancement, faculty development and mentorship, and employment assistance for spouses. See Appendix A for a copy of the questionnaire and Tables 1-3.

FINDINGS

Of the total sample surveyed approximately 55.6 percent of the respondents were male. The age of respondents ranged from 29 to 64 with the average age being forty-nine. The majority of the respondents were white (90.1 percent) and possessed, in most instances, the Ph.D. or Ed.D. degree (69.1 percent). The number of years experience in higher education varied from two to thirty-five with

a mean of 15.8 years. In addition, the larger number of those in the pilot survey were full-time faculty members, with over 56.3 percent holding either associate or full professor rank. The majority (55.7 percent) were not tenured. Almost seventy three percent were faculty, a smaller percentage were administrators (17.5), and 10.0 percent were half-time faculty and administration. Approximately 78.0 percent of the respondents were married, and most (70 percent) had one or more children.

Tables 1 and 2 present the results of a one-way analysis of variance employed to examine mean differences between males and females for selected demographic and attitudinal variables. None of the variables designed to assess the organizational culture exhibited significantly different mean scores for males and females. It appears that males and females view current opportunities in the same way, and have similar perceptions of what the institution should be providing. Also, males and females do not appear to differ significantly in terms of rank, salary, educational level or tenure. Of significance, however, was the fact that male faculty members were more likely to be married.

In order to assess perceived opportunities for men and women a scale was generated from the following items: 1) fewer married women achieve high academic rank than married men; 2) men are more successful in combining parenthood and academic careers; 3) the more children a man has, the more difficult it is to balance a family and career; 4) career advancement for the professional woman often means limiting family size; 5) men are more likely to relocate to a better job regardless of spouse's employment status; 6) women are less likely to engage in research

because of family responsibilities; 6) women's career choices tend to follow a pattern of fragmented phases, due to family obligations, rather than a smooth continuum; and 8) women when compared to men tend to under-utilize networking for professional advancement. According to Table 3, male faculty possess a statistically significant higher mean score on this scale than females. The mean scores for males and females were 19.31 and 15.53, respectively ($p < .01$). This indicates that women tend to agree with the statements to a greater degree than men. An item analysis indicates statistically significant differences for males and females on 1) fewer married women achieve high academic rank than married men, 2) men are more likely to relocate to a better job regardless of spouse's employment status, and 3) women are less likely to engage in research because of family responsibilities (approaches significance, $p = .0594$)

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Previous research has shown that structural and personal constraints impact the aspirations and level of success for all workers, but especially women in higher education. However, these findings did not hold true in this analysis. Men and women appear to view structural opportunities within higher education in the same way and to have similar perceptions of what universities should be doing. Of significance were differences between responses for males and females on attitudinal items concerning inequities for the sexes. It appears that the sample sees the formal institution in the same way, but women still possess the attitude that they are constrained professionally by the existing informal structure or because of outside

responsibilities. All organizations, but especially higher education, should understand and address the perceptions of their employees and understand the subsequent consequences. A proactive stance could result in the implementation of policies to enhance the satisfaction, achievement, and productivity of women in higher education and reduce the variance between men's and women's perceptions of the organizational culture.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

WHAT TEACHER EDUCATORS CAN DO TO CREATE AN ANDROGYNOUS CLASSROOM CLIMATE

Effective educators can learn to deal with gender-related differences, even disparities, in their classrooms, the workplace, and in their own minds. In the workplace and in the classroom, females and males encounter gender-specific disparate outcomes, although to say that ALL females exhibit the same behaviors and thought processes is erroneous. To complicate matters, gender differences also cut cross ethnic, geographical and socioeconomic boundaries. What educators have learned is that they can be agents of productive change, regarding equity issues, and that change begins in the individual (Grossman and Grossman, 1994).

When educators discuss what equity is, they usually mean that students are treated fairly, not similarly. In other words, creating an androgynous classroom climate does not mean that males and females are always treated alike. Differences are present; some are inherent, some are conditioned. Even though educators may quibble over the causes of gender differences, most would agree that natural

differences are apparent, and they can accommodate these differences by altering their attitudes and instructional practices. Such accommodations do not mean that students conform to one way, one style, and one course of action.

When someone asks a teacher what s/he teaches, educators will usually answer with a subject or course name. But teachers do not teach curriculum or subject matter; they teach students (Grossman and Grossman, 1994). To prepare students for the 21st Century, the ultimate goal is to create climates that 1) value students as people, 2) are free of prejudice, 3) embrace and affirm diversity, and 4) utilize strategies to produce a competent, inclusive citizenry. Such outcomes start with modeling, self-examination, and behavioral changes.

The following self-quiz has two objectives: 1) to assist you in examining your attitudes about differences, particularly those associated with gender; and 2) to provide you with classroom strategies that foster androgynous environments, curriculum, and instruction. The mission of any school nearly always espouses high ideals of equity, equality, and respect. Educators can effectively perpetuate these high ideals by living these ideals, modeling them, and rewarding behaviors that emulate these ideals. A positive, affirming climate addresses not only what IS but also what SHOULD BE. The following strategies provide the scaffolding for such positive changes.

SELF-QUIZ

Does your teaching style favor one gender over another? Rate the following behaviors using a four point scale: 4)always; 3)most of the time; 2)occasionally; 1)never.

_____ 1. I value male and female students the same regardless of socioeconomic, cultural, ethnic, and academic backgrounds or abilities.
_____ 2. I evaluate and select textbooks and other instructional materials that are androgynous, and that use an equitable amount of androgynous examples, pictures, and diagrams.
_____ 3. I call on female students as often as I call on male students.
_____ 4. I ask female students as many higher order questions as male students.
_____ 5. I wait on female students to respond to questions as long as I want on male students.
_____ 6. I am equally attentive to the misbehavior of female and male students.
_____ 7. I praise male and female students equally for their contributions, achievement, and creativity.
_____ 8. I discourage helplessness in all students.
_____ 9. I never use gender differences as a basis for making decisions.
_____10. I accept competitiveness and cooperation equally for males and females.
_____11. I accept students' freedom to choose their level of androgynous behaviors.
_____12. I encourage males and females to participate in activities associated with the opposite gender. For example, I encourage females to excel in science, computer literacy, auto mechanics and math and boys in foreign language, art and vocational courses. (Gross and Grossman, 1994)

Activity: Reflect upon your behaviors that are productive and those that are not. What will you change?

CLASSROOM STRATEGIES THAT PROMOTE ANDROGYNY

1. Give females leadership roles in the classroom (for instance, in cooperative learning groups).
2. Promote an androgynous climate and environment by using both cooperative learning (favored by females) and competition (preferred by males).
3. When using cooperative learning, emphasize positive interdependence among all students by varying roles, mentoring students to be team players, and reinforcing an "all for one, one for all" mindset.
4. Eliminate competitive activities that "pit" males against females.
5. Celebrate and recognize the contributions of women. Example: Catherine Greene AND Eli Whitney invented the cotton gin but Catherine was prevented from holding the patent.
6. Encourage females to measure their performance against standards, not the performance of males.

7. Foster understanding of the developmental differences in males and females, especially during the school years.
8. Teach males and females that they both have unlimited opportunities for career success by using "atypical" resource speakers: female school superintendents, male early childhood teachers, female mayors, male nurses, and female engineers.
9. Use classroom procedures that promote equity by calling on students to answer questions in a random manner and utilizing androgynous roles.
10. Avoid stereotypes in words and practice. (ASCD Update, 1996, Grossman and Grossman, 1994)

REFERENCES

Adelman, C. (1991). Women at thirtysomething: Paradoxes of attainment. Office of Educational Research and Improvement (Ed.). Washington, D.C.

Astin, H.S. (1990). Educating women: A promise and a vision for the future. American Journal of Education.

Barbee, A. P. and Cunningham, M. R. Departmental issues in dual-academic marriages. Paper presented at the Annual convention of American Psychological Association (98th, Boston, MA, August 10-14, 1990). Pub. date August 90.

Baron, J. N. (1962). The organizational society: An analysis and a theory. New York: Random House.

Bayley, L. J. (1992). The role of women's studies in fostering women's educational and career prestige aspirations. Paper presented for 1992 AERA Conference, Los angeles, CA.

Bell, C. & Chase, S. (1993). The underrepresentation of women in school leadership. C. Marshall (Ed.) The new politics of race and gender (145-154). Washington, D.C.: The Falmer Press.

Bird, G. (1984). Family and career characteristics of women and men college and university administrator. Journal of NAWDAC. 47, 121-128.

Checkley, Kathy (1996, Jarvary) Reducing gender bias in school. ASCD Education Update, 38, 1, 6, 8.

Commission of Professionals in Science and Technology. (1984). Professional women and minorities: A manpower data resource service. Ed. 7. Washington, D.C.

Dublon, F. 1983. Women doctoral students in higher education administration: Life-style aspirations and multiple role commitments. Journal of NAWDAC. 47, 52-56.

Edwards, R.C. (1975). The social relations of production in the firm and labor market structure. R.C. Edwards, M. Reich, D. M. Gordon (eds.) Labor Market Segmentation, (3-26), Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Estler, S. E. (1975). Women as leaders in education.

Ford, R.L. (1988). Work Organization, and Power. (321-371), Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.

Fox-Genovese, E., Giacobbe, M., McClure, P., and Sadker, D. (1996, January) How can educators ensure gender equity in their schools and classrooms? ASCD Education Update, 38, 7.

German, K. M. Majority and minority women in communication departments: Expectations, experience, and exploitation. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of Speech Communication Association. (75th, November 18-21, 1989). Pub. date 20 November 89.

Grossman, H. & Grossman, S. (1994.) Gender Issues in Education. Allyn and Bacon: Needham Heights, MA.

Henley, N. M. & Bartle, K. M. (1987). Is there life after women's studies? Women's studies graduates evaluate a program in relation to their current lives. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Women's Studies Association, Atlanta, GA. In Bayley, L. J. (1992). The role of women's studies in fostering women's educational and career prestige aspirations. Paper presented for 1992 AERA Conference, Los Angeles, CA.

Hensel, N. (1991). Realizing gender equality in higher education: The need to integrate work/family issues. Eric Digest. Washington, D.C.: The George Washington University.

Kanter, R.M. (1977). Men and Women of the Corporation. (245-253), New York: Basic Books.

Lindsey, L. (1994). Gender Roles, A Sociological Perspective. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Manning, R. (1993). Gender, moral orientation, and salary. Paper presented at the Women In Higher Education Conference, El Paso, TX.

Marshall, C. (1993). The new politics of race and gender. 1992 Yearbook of the Politics of Education Association, Washington, D.C.: Falmer Press.

Piore, M.J. (1975). Notes for a theory of labor market stratification. In R.C. Edwards, M. Reich and D.M. Gordon (eds.) Labor Market Segmentation, (125-150), Lexington, MA.: D.C. Heath.

Ries, P. & Stone, A. (eds). (1992). The American Woman 1992-93 A Status Report. New York: W. W. Norton and Company.

Selke, M. & Collins, M. (1994). Dr. Mom Project. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Chicago, IL.

Simon, H.A. (1947). Administrative Behavior. (p. xvi), New York: Macmillan.

Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board, Austin. (1991, December). Parity 2000: Achieving equity for women in higher education. Report of the Council for Women in Higher Education. Austin, TX.

Weishaar, M., Chiaravalli, K. & Jones, F. (1984). Dual-career couples in higher education. Journal of NAWDAC. 47, 120-124.

Widnall, S. E. (1988). AAAS presidential lecture. Science, 241, 1740-1745.

Wood, J. (1994). Gendered lives. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Zappert, L. T. & Stanbury, K. (1984). In the pipeline: A comparative analysis of men and women in graduate programs in science, engineering and medicine at Stanford University (Working paper 20, Institute for Research on Women and Gender) Stanford University, Stanford, CA.

APPENDIX A

FACULTY ATTITUDE SURVEY
EVALUATING THE WORK ENVIRONMENT

The following questionnaire has been developed to assess the degree to which a university's environment promotes and supports personal and professional opportunities for faculty. Your institution has been selected to participate in this process. Your participation is greatly appreciated. The questionnaire is completely anonymous, and all information is strictly confidential. Please return your completed questionnaire to Dr. Charles Weiner at Box 7514. If you have any questions feel free to contract Dr. Regina Watkins, University of North Alabama, 205-760-4837.

Please respond to the following questions in terms of the current state of your university and in terms of what you feel your university should be doing.

1--does not meet the need
2--somewhat meets the need
3--partially meets the need
4--completely meets the need

1--should not be providing opportunity
2--should somewhat meet the need
3--should partially meet the need
4--should be completely meeting the need

	CURRENTLY				SHOULD BE			
Availability of on-campus child care for infants.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Availability of on-campus child care for pre-school children.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Availability of after school programs for children.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Availability of personal leave days for family emergencies (not sick leave).	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Availability of tuition waivers for family members.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunity for advancement to a higher faculty rank.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunity for advancement to administrative positions.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Availability of faculty development funds for advancement/growth.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Availability of employment assistance for spouses of new faculty.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunity for relationship as mentor.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Opportunity for relationship as a mentee.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4

Please respond to the following questions in terms of your agreement or disagreement with each statement.

1--strongly agree 2--agree 3--disagree 4--strongly disagree

_____ Fewer married women achieve high academic rank than married men.

_____ Men are more successful in combining parenthood and academic careers.

_____ The more children a man has, the more difficult it is to balance a family and career.

_____ Career advancement for the professional woman often means limiting family size.

_____ Men are more likely to relocate to a better job regardless of spouse's employment status.

_____ Women are less likely to engage in research because of family responsibilities.

_____ Women's career choices tend to follow a pattern of fragmented phases, due to family obligations, rather than a smooth continuum.

_____ Women when compared to men tend to under-utilize networking for professional advancement.

Demographic information:

What is your age? _____

What is your ethnicity?
1) Black American _____
2) White American _____
3) Hispanic American _____
4) Other _____

What is your gender? 1) Male _____
2) Female _____

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

How long have you been employed in higher education? _____

What is your highest level of education?
1) B.S. or B.A. _____
2) M.S. or M.A. _____
3) Ph.D. or Ed.D _____

What is your academic rank?
1) Full Professor _____
2) Associate Professor _____
3) Assistant Professor _____
4) Instructor _____
5) Other _____

What is your current position?
1) faculty _____
2) administration _____

What is your current teaching status?
1) full-time _____
2) part-time _____
3) adjunct _____

Are you tenured?
1) yes _____
2) no _____

Are you currently teaching an overload?
1) yes _____
2) no _____

Is your contract 9 or 12 month?
1) 9 month _____
2) 12 month _____

On the average, how many hours a week do you work in the home or with family responsibilities and on the job?
1) in the home (family responsibilities) _____
2) on the job _____

What is your current marital status?
1) married _____
2) divorced _____
3) single _____
4) widowed _____

How many children do you have? _____

What is your current salary?
1) under $24,999 _____
2) 25,000-34,999 _____
3) 35,000-44,999 _____
4) 45,000-54,999 _____
5) 55,000 or above _____

Have you ever changed institutions to advance financially or professionally?
1) financially _____
2) professionally _____
3) no _____

If so, how many times have you moved for either of these reasons? _____

Have you ever changed institutions to advance your spouse's career?
1) financially _____
2) professionally _____
3) no _____

If so, how many times have you moved for either of theses reasons? _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION. YOUR ASSISTANCE IS GREATLY APPRECIATED.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

TABLE 1: Means and Significance Levels for Males and Females on Organizational Supports Currently Provided.

Question	Males	Females	Significance
Availability of on-campus child care for infants.	1.16	1.28	.4903
Availability of on-campus child care for pre-school children.	1.84	1.94	.7080
Availability of after school programs for children.	1.04	1.22	.3485
Availability of personal leave days for family emergencies (not sick leave).	2.56	2.25	.3305
Availability of tuition waivers for family members.	3.36	3.00	.2123
Opportunity for advancement to a higher faculty rank.	3.04	2.64	.1043
Opportunity for advancement to administrative positions.	2.46	2.00	.0663
Availability of faculty development funds for advancement/growth.	2.51	2.17	.0818
Availability of employment assistance for spouses of new faculty.	1.56	1.47	.6934
Opportunity for relationship as mentor.	2.27	2.28	.9649
Opportunity for relationship as a mentee.	2.31	1.97	.1874

TABLE 2: Means and Significance Levels for Males and Females on Organizational Supports Which Should be Provided.

Question	Males	Females	Significance
Availability of on-campus child care for infants.	2.38	2.67	.3522
Availability of on-campus child care for pre-school children.	2.67	2.78	.7231
Availability of after school programs for children.	2.09	2.47	.2414
Availability of personal leave days for family emergencies (not sick leave).	3.27	3.11	.5838
Availability of tuition waivers for family members.	3.36	3.33	.9376
Opportunity for advancement to a higher faculty rank.	3.71	3.61	.6306
Opportunity for advancement to administrative positions.	3.20	2.97	.3636
Availability of faculty development funds for advancement/growth.	3.51	3.56	.8311
Availability of employment assistance for spouses of new faculty.	2.69	2.31	.1669
Opportunity for relationship as mentor.	2.87	3.33	.0770
Opportunity for relationship as a mentee.	2.82	3.25	.1358

TABLE 3: Means and Significance Levels for Males and Females on Attitudinal Items, Including Total Scale Score.

Question	Males	Females	Significance
Fewer married women achieve high academic rank than married men.	2.13	1.56	.0143
Men are more successful in combining parenthood and academic careers.	2.64	2.22	.1144
The more children a man has, the more difficult it is to balance a family and career.	2.27	2.69	.0616
Career advancement for the professional woman often means limiting family size.	1.91	1.75	.4343
Men are more likely to relocate to a better job regardless of spouse's employment status.	1.87	1.42	.0192
Women are less likely to engage in research because of family responsibilities.	2.42	2.00	.0594
Women's career choices tend to follow a pattern of fragmented phases, due to family obligations, rather than a smooth continuum.	2.04	1.75	.1557
Women when compared to men tend to under-utilize networking for professional advancement.	2.27	1.92	.1586
TOTAL SCALE SCORE	19.32	15.53	.0003